



Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

FILING DATE

FIRST NAMED APPLICANT

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

08/615,876

03/14/96

OYA

1232-4253

WM02/1211

MORGAN & FINNEGAN 345 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK NY 10154 ART UNITE I VAS TRAHER NUMBER

32

DATE MAILED: 11

12/11/00

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/22/07	
☐ This action is FINAL.	
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, <b>prose</b> accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.	ecution as to the merits is closed in
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be 1.136(a).	month(s), or thirty days, within the period for response will cause obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR
Disposition of Claims	
X Claim(s) 3-10, 16, 18, 20-23, and 25-28	is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
X Claim(s) 22, 23, 41, 42, 57, and 58	is/are allowed.
✓ Claim(s) 3,5, 7-10, 16, 16, 20, 21, 25-27, 29, 31-40, 43	, and 45-56 is/are rejected.
☑ Claim(s) 4,6,28,30 and 44	is/are objected to.
☐ Claims ar	re subject to restriction or election requirement.
Application Papers	
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are ob	jected to by the Examiner.
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗌 approved 🔲 disapproved.
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
🔀 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d).
☑ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents	s have been
✓ received.	
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)	·
$\ \square$ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT I	Rule 17.2(a)).
*Certified copies not received:	
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(e).
Attachment(s)	
☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892	
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).	
X Interview Summary, PTO-413	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	
Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	

Art Unit: 2602

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. Claims 12, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 2. Claims 12 recites the limitation "change means" in line 3, whereas independent claim 1 does not recite change or "change means".

Claim 13 recites the limitation "layout-information change means" in line 2, whereas independent claim 1 does not recite layout-information or "change means". and line 4 recites the limitation "layout-display means" where as claim 1 recites "camera-status display means".

Claim 14 recites the limitation "layout-information change means" in line 2, whereas independent claim 1 does not recite layout-information or "change means", and line 4 recites the limitation "layout-display means" where as claim 1 recites "camera-status display means".

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2602

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan.

Considering claim 1, Morgan discloses the claimed a camera control system for selecting one of a plurality of controllable cameras connected to a network, and for controlling video display, comprising camera-status display means for real-time displaying statuses of at least two of the cameras (col 4 lines 54-68, col 5 lines 1-10, and fig 2).

Considering claim 2, Morgan discloses 1) the claimed layout-display means (fig 2), 2) the claimed symbol-display means for displaying camera symbols representing the plurality of cameras over a layout displayed on said layout-display means (fig 2), 3) the claimed wherein said symbol-display means displays one or more current statuses of predetermined features of the cameras with the camera symbols (col 4 lines 54-68, col 5 lines 1-10, and fig 2).

Considering claim 8, Morgan discloses 1) the claimed camera control means for controlling the cameras (col 3 lines 49-58), 2) the claimed management means for managing the

Art Unit: 2602

statuses of the cameras (col 5 lines 10-48), 3) the claimed wherein said camera control means notifies said management means of the statuses of the cameras (col 3 lines 49-58 and col 5 lines 10-48).

Considering claim 9, Morgan discloses the claimed wherein said camera control means notifies the statuses of the cameras in accordance with instruction from said management means (col 3 lines 49-58 - display touch screen manager instructs controller to control camera position).

Considering claim 10, Morgan discloses the claimed wherein said camera-status display means displays the statuses of the cameras in accordance with information outputted by said management means (col 3 lines 49-58 - display touch screen manager controls status of what is displayed).

Considering claim 11, Morgan discloses 1) the claimed a camera control system for selecting one of a plurality of controllable cameras connected to a network, and for controlling video display and camera parameters (col 4 lines 46-68 and col 5 lines 1-10), 2) the claimed a layout display means (fig 2), 3) the claimed symbol display means for displaying one or more camera symbols representing the cameras, over a layout displayed on said layout-display means (fig 2), 4) the claimed change means for interactively changing the camera symbol, in accordance with change of initial setting of the system (col 5 lines 10-48 - camera with field of view symbol is changed with changes in field of view setting).

Considering claim 12, Morgan discloses the claimed wherein the change of the camera symbol by said change means is addition, deletion and changing of position and direction of the

Art Unit: 2602

camera symbol (col 5 lines 10-48 - camera with field of view symbol is changed with changes in field of view setting).

Considering claim 13, Morgan discloses the claimed further comprising layout-information change means for interactively changing the layout displayed on said layout-display means (col 5 lines 1-32).

Considering claim 14, Morgan discloses the claimed wherein said layout-information change means interactively add and deletes the layout displayed on said layout-display means (col 5 lines 1-47 - user can change layout and turning on or off camera adds or deletes field of view symbol to layout).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgan in view of McGahan.

Considering claim 15, Morgan discloses 1) the claimed a camera control system for selecting one of a plurality of controllable cameras connected to a network, and for controlling video display and the camera (col 4 lines 54-68, col 5 lines 1-10, and fig 2), 2) the claimed layout-

Art Unit: 2602

display means (fig 2), 3) the claimed symbol-display means for displaying one or more camera symbols representing the cameras, over a layout displayed on said layout-display means (fig 2), except for the claimed change-reflection means for on-line reflecting change of initial setting of said system by one of a plurality of users, on the layout and the camera symbol screen of another user.

Morgan discloses of camera control system comprising a symbol-display screen for displaying to the user which of the plurality of cameras are on are in use. McGahan also discloses of a camera control system comprising a plurality of user viewing stations. It would have been obvious in modifying the invention of Morgan to include a plurality of user stations the camera control system would have had added versatility because the cameras would have the ability to be controlled and images viewed from a plurality of locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Morgan to include a plurality of user stations, as taught by McGahan, wherein the camera in operation or use would have been displayed in a layout at the plurality of work stations, because it would have been obvious that providing a plurality of work stations displaying the status of the plurality of cameras would have added versatility to the camera control system because the images generated would have the ability to be displayed at a plurality of locations and control of the cameras would also be possible from a plurality of locations.

Art Unit: 2602

# Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 2602

### Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- 1) Lang Remote Video Viewing And Recording System For Remotely Occurring Events
- 2) Washino Personal-Computer-Based Video Production System
- 3) Diner Adjustable Control Station With Movable Monitors And Cameras For Viewing Systems In Robotics And Teleoperations
- 4) Thompson Synchronization Of Vertical Phase Of The Video Signals In A Video System
- 5) Cortjens et al. Method For Automatically Adjusting The Pan And Tilt Of A Video

  Conferencing System Camera

## Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

### or faxed to:

(703) 305-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

Art Unit: 2602

(703) 305 - 5399 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 4038. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Peng, can be reached at (703) 305 - 4702.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305 - 3900.

VS 9/4/97

\$

JOHN K. PENG SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER